**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH**

**AT HYDERABAD**

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L. NARASIMHA REDDY**

**AND**

-

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE D. APPA RAO**

**TAKEN UP WRIT PETITION NO. 9869 OF 2006**

**DATED: 30-05-2006**

BETWEEN:

V. Bhavani

……Petitioner

AND

The Deputy Director, Director of

Revenue Intelligence, Regional Unit,

Hyderabad and two others

……Respondents

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L. NARASIMHA REDDY**

**AND**

-

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE D. APPA RAO**

**TAKEN UP WRIT PETITION NO. 9869 OF 2006**

**ORDER:** (per Sri L. Narasimha Reddy, J)

The writ petition was treated as a taken up case on the basis of the telegram issued by the petitioner. She alleged that her husband by name V. Bala Nageswara Rao was detained by the respondents herein.

This Court issued notices to the respondents as well as the learned Advocate General. On behalf of the respondents, learned Assistant Solicitor General filed a counter affidavit. Learned Advocate General also filed a separate counter affidavit.

A perusal of the counter affidavit filed by the respondents discloses that the husband of the petitioner is connected with an industry by name M/s. Venkat

Pharma Limited having its factory premises at Vijayawada and registered office at Hyderabad. It is stated that on receiving intelligence information an inspection was conducted in the premises of the factory and it was found that illicit remittances were being received from overseas resulting in loss to the State. The respondents have also stated that during the search, a laptop computer was recovered from the residence of the Managing Director of the Company and on the basis of the information deciphered, the husband of the petitioner was summoned to appear before them on 11-05-2006. The husband of the petitioner is stated to have attended the office of the respondents on 11-05-2006 and left the office after his statement was recorded. The allegation that the husband of the petitioner was detained is denied.

In that view of the matter, the writ petition is closed.

_____

**L. NARASINHA REDDY, J**

_____

**D. APPA RAO, J**

30-05-2006

ks